

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 16, 2005. Claims 1 to 31 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 16, 25, 30 and 31 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Turning first to a formal matter involving the drawings, the instant Office Action acknowledged receipt of revised Figure 6, which was filed on February 2, 2005, but did not indicate its disposition (i.e., whether new Figure 6 has been accepted or objected to). It is assumed that Figure 6 is acceptable, but if the Examiner intended otherwise, he is respectfully requested to clarify his position on this new drawing.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 12, 14 to 17, 19 to 26 and 28 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,737,552 (Lavallee), and the remaining claims were rejected under § 103(a) over Lavallee in view of U.S. Patent 6,348,929 (Acharya). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns playback of a moving picture that is comprised of a plurality of scenes, with each of the plurality of scenes being comprised by a plurality of frames. At least one representative frame is extracted from a scene, and data for the representative frame is stored together with data for a hierarchical level of the scene. Plural ones of the representative frames are displayed concurrently, and they are displayed concurrently in chronological order, all based on an external designation of the

hierarchical level. A selection of one of the concurrently-displayed images is received on the basis of an external designation, such as from a user. It is possible to play back the scene corresponding to the selected frame.

In one representative (but non-limiting) embodiment of the invention shown in Figure 5, a playback window 501 is provided for playing back the movie. Significance buttons 507 and 508 are provided for receiving a user's designation of hierarchical level. Scene buttons 505 are provided for concurrent display of representative frames extracted from scenes in the movie. The concurrently-displayed images are displayed in chronological order, and they are displayed based on which of the significance buttons 507 and 508 is selected. Based on user-selection of one of the plural representative frames (that is, one of frames 505(1), 505(2) or 505(3)), the movie may be played back in playback window 501.

Lavallee and Acharya have both been reviewed, but they are not seen to disclose or to suggest anything similar to the above, particularly as it relates to the concurrent and chronological display of representative frames extracted from scenes comprising a moving picture. The Office Action (at pages 10 and 11) indicates that it has interpreted the claimed "representative frame" as all of the frames of a scene because they "correspond to the scene". This comment is not understood. Lavallee makes no differentiation between ordinary playback of all frames in a scene as opposed to display of a representative frame that is extracted from a scene. In other words, there is nothing in Lavallee that discloses or suggests the concurrent display of images of representative frames that have been extracted from a scene, with the concurrently-displayed images

being displayed chronologically. Moreover, there is nothing in Lavaltee that shows that the concurrently and chronologically displayed images are displayed based on an external designation of hierarchical level, nor is there anything in Lavaltee that would have disclosed or suggested receipt of a selection of one of the concurrently-displayed images of the representative frames on the basis of an external designation (such as that from a user).

Acharya has been reviewed, but is not seen to add anything of significance to the above-noted deficiencies of Lavaltee. In particular, and as understood by Applicants, Acharya was cited for its alleged disclosure of image compression, which is in any event unrelated to formation of reduced images as claimed in Claims 4, 13, 18 and 27. That is, image compression differs significantly from image reduction, in ways that are understood clearly by those of ordinary skill.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein define subject matter that is neither anticipated nor would have been obvious from any of the teachings of Lavaltee or Lavaltee combined with Acharya. Allowance of the claims herein is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 100588v1